BEFORE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

FCC 96-182

In the Matter of

Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996) CC Docket No. 96-98

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIG

COMMENTS OF KENTUCKY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION REGARDING NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Submitted By:

Attorney

Kentucky Public Service Commission

P. O. Box 615

Frankfort, Kentucky 40602

(502) 564-3940

No. of Copies rec'd List ABCDE

BEFORE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

FCC 96-182

In the Matter of)
Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996	
COMMENTS OF THE KENTUCKY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION AND 16 1996 REGARDING NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING COMMISSION	

Comes now the Kentucky Public Service Commission and for its comments regarding the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking states as follows:

On April 21, 1995, the Kentucky Public Service Commission initiated a proceeding to investigate unbundling network services, number portability, local dialing parity, interconnection fees, local service resale, cost based access to poles, conduits, and rights-of-way, switched local access competition, its effect on universal service, and the potential need for changing non-traffic sensitive access charges.¹

After months of discovery, the Kentucky Commission conducted a public hearing from March 25, 1996 through March 29, 1996. Many of the issues discussed at the public hearing were framed by this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. The major telecommunications

¹ Administrative Case No. 355, An Inquiry Into Local Competition, Universal Service, and the Non-Traffic Sensitive Access Rate.

carriers that serve Kentucky participated in the hearing. Testimony was presented by interexchange carriers, local exchange carriers, competitive access providers, cable television providers and, on behalf of consumer interests, the Kentucky Attorney General.

The Kentucky Commission anticipates entering an order during the summer of 1996 addressing issues relating to local competition. The Kentucky Commission will establish parameters for affordable rates, support of rural, insular and high cost areas, support of low income consumers, advanced services of schools, libraries and health care providers, reasonably comparable rates and other issues. When the order is concluded, the Kentucky Commission will forward a copy to the FCC.

Any rules or guidelines that the FCC adopts should be minimal, fair, and allow sufficient flexibility for states to accommodate specific situations in their respective jurisdictions. This same spirit should extend to all market participants. Market participants should have the flexibility to adhere to any regulatory guideline or rule in their respective least-cost fashion, but not hinder the continued formation of a competitive local market.

It is unclear how the broad pricing principles contemplated by the FCC will impact small Class B and non-Tier I companies. The rules as contemplated would only seem to be appropriate for Class A and Tier I companies. This Commission is concerned that the contemplated rules will be overly burdensome in small, rural companies. The establishment and implementation of rules governing competition in rural, insular regions should be left entirely to the states.

Paragraph 27

The Kentucky Commission embraces the implementation of standardization in the national interconnection policy. The approach taken by the FCC should be one that provides competitors a general, minimum, ubiquitous framework for entry. However, each state needs to have the flexibility to handle unique policy concerns which may arise.

Paragraph 30

The Kentucky Commission concurs with the FCC's implied intentions to allow uniform national market entry for competitors. This uniform national market entry is necessary to ensure successful local competition. However, each state should have the authority to require registration of market participants within individual states.

Paragraph 33

The Kentucky Commission embraces the establishment by the FCC of minimum unbundled elements, if the FCC reserves to the states the right to examine individual, explicit unbundling requests.

Paragraphs 117-120

We generally agree that the FCC has the authority to establish nationwide pricing principles. This will aid states in establishing

rates during an arbitration process and in reviewing Bell Operating Company's statements of generally available terms and conditions. However, the pricing principles should be sufficiently broad to allow states to recognize unique situations which may not exist elsewhere. States are the most familiar with the specific circumstances surrounding their own jurisdictional companies and should have the authority to set rates.

Paragraphs 121-122

We do not agree that an enforcement mechanism should be adopted. States should have the authority to enforce compliance with their respective specific pricing rules, which will have been adopted within the parameters of national pricing principles. Any enforcement mechanism adopted by the FCC should only address compliance with the national pricing principles. However, a monitoring mechanism may be helpful in helping the FCC and states work together to insure compliance with national pricing principles. Further, we agree that there should be no distinction between the pricing principles applicable to interconnection and unbundled network elements.

Paragraphs 123-125

We agree that states are precluded from setting rates by use of traditional cost-of-service regulation, with its detailed examination of historical carrier costs and rate bases. Some other form of cost-based regulation or price setting on a forward-looking cost methodology is appropriate.

Kentucky Public Service Commission Comments
Page 5

Paragraphs 126-133

We agree that an incremental cost methodology, such as LRIC or TSLRIC is appropriate for pricing interconnection and unbundled network elements. Further, some provision should be made for the recovery of a legitimate portion of joint and common costs and rates should yield reasonable levels of return on capital. These rates should be viewed as a price ceiling for the local exchange carrier.

Paragraphs 134-143

Generally, the establishment of pricing parameters is reasonable if there is enough leeway to accommodate state-specific situations. We agree with paragraph 135.

In our local competition docket, referenced above, the major LECs have been ordered to produce cost studies for local service. However, a final decision has not been rendered concerning the use of proxy methods for setting rates.

Paragraphs 149-156

We agree that costs should be recovered in a manner that reflects the way they were incurred. We are reviewing the "switched platform approach" in our local competition docket. Generally, term and volume discounts for unbundled network elements or services are acceptable, as long as they are offered to any customer willing and able to commit to the same (standard) terms and conditions of service.

Kentucky Public Service Commission Comments
Page 6

Paragraph 159

We want the definition of "exchange carrier" to include wireless services. However, discounted rates and unbundled local network elements and their respective rates should not be available to carriers that are not intending to provide local service. Thus, unbundled rates should not be used to avoid charges otherwise applicable.

Paragraph 176

States should have the right to identify services which are currently subsidized and prohibit their resale. This prohibition should be especially true prior to the expected restructure of rates.

Paragraphs 180-181

The FCC should issue broad guidelines for determining avoided costs. However, states should be allowed to determine the avoided amount through specific company audits. This is especially true for Class B (USoA) companies which may deviate from the strict account classifications found in Part 32.

Paragraphs 226-244

Mutual and reciprocal compensation and "bill and keep" arrangements are pending issues in our local competition docket. We are aware of the costs and benefits associated with each arrangement. We are mindful of the balance required to maintain fairness and foster local competition without imposing undue administrative burdens.

Kentucky Public Service Commission Comments
Page 7

Paragraphs 260-261

The establishment of guidelines by the FCC regarding the legitimacy of a "bona fide request" and any other guidance relative to rural exemptions may be helpful to the states.

Paragraph 264

The arbitration process will be helped by the establishment of minimum federal standards. However, states must retain wide latitude to arbitrate agreement by parties and to review negotiated agreements.

The Kentucky Commission looks forward to participating to the fullest extent possible in this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Comments of Kentucky Public Service Commission Regarding Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has been served by first-class mail, postage prepaid, on the following this 15th day of May, 1996.

International Transcription Service Room 640 1990 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Office of the Secretary Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

Lary Povich Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

Martha S. Hogerty Public Counsel for State of Missouri Room 250 Harry S. Truman Building Jefferson City, MO 65102

Deborah Dupont, Federal Staff Chair Federal Communications Commission Suite 257 2000 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Paul E. Pederson, State Staff Chair Missouri Public Service Commission PO Box 360 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Eileen Benner Idaho Public Utilities Commission PO Box 83720 Boise, ID 83720-0074

Charles Bolle South Dakota Public Utilities Commission State Capitol 500 E. Capital Avenue Pierre, SD 57501-5070

William Howden
Federal Communications Commission
Suite 812
2000 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Lorraine Kenyon Alaska Public Utilities Commission Suite 400 1016 West Sixth Avenue Anchorage, AK 99501

Debra M. Kriete Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission PO Box 3265 Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Chara Kuehn Federal Communications Commission Suite 257 - 2000 L Street Washington, D.C. 20036 Mark Long Florida Public Service Commission Gerald Gunter Building 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Samuel Loudenslager Arkansas Public Service Commission PO Box 400 Little Rock, AR 72203-0400

Sandra Makeeff Iowa Utilities Board Lucas State Office Building Des Moines IA 50319

Philip F. McClelland Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate 1425 Strawberry Square Harrisburg, PA 17120

Michael A. McRae DC Office of the People's Counsel Suite 500 1133 15th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005

Rafi Mohammed Federal Communications Commission Suite 812 2000 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Terry Monroe New York Public Service Commission Three Empire Plaza Albany, NY 12223

Andrew Mulitz Federal Communications Commission Suite 257 2000 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Mark Nadel Federal Communications Commission Room 542 1919 M Street Washington, D.C. 20554

Gary Oddi Federal Communications Commission Suite 257 2000 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Teresa Pitts Washington Utilities & Trans. Comm. PO Box 47250 Olympia, WA 98504-7250 Jeanine Poltronieri Federal Communications Commission Suite 257 2000 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

James Bradford Ramsay National Assoc. of Regulatory Utility Commissioners 12201 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20423

Jonathan Reel Federal Communications Commission Suite 257 2000 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Brian Roberts California Public Utilities Commission 505 Van-Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102-3298

Gary Seigel
Federal Communications Commission
Suite 812
2000 L Street
Washington, D.C. 20036

Pamela Szymczak Federal Communications Commission Suite 257 2000 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Whiting Thayer Federal Communications Commission Suite 812 2000 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Deborah S. Waldbaum Colorado Office of Consumer Counsel Suite 610 1580 Logan Street Denver, CO 80203

Alex Belinfante Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

The Hon. Reed E. Hundt, Chairman Federal Communications Commission Room 814 1919 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

The Hon. Andrew C. Barrett Commissioner Federal Communications Commission Room 826 1919 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

The Hon. Susan Ness, Commissioner Federal Communications Commission Room 832 1919 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

The Hon. Julia Johnson, Commissioner Florida Public Service Commission Capital Circle Office Center 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 The Hon. Kenneth McClure Vice Chairman Missouri Public Service Commission Suite 530 301 W. High Street Jefferson City, MO 65102

The Hon. Sharon L. Nelson Chairman Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission PO Box 47250 Olympia, WA 98504-7250

The Hon. Laska Schoenfelder Commissioner South Dakota Public Utilities Commission 500 E. Capital Avenue Pierre, SD 57501

AMY E DOUGHERTY Staff Attorney

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF KENTUCKY

730 Schenkel Lane P.O. Box 615

Frankfort, KY 40602